



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

52

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/583,411	05/31/2000	Kurt Russell Taylor	AUS000153US1	3019
35525	7590	06/13/2005	EXAMINER	
IBM CORP (YA) C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC P.O. BOX 802333 DALLAS, TX 75380			TRUONG, LECHI	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2194	

DATE MAILED: 06/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/583,411

Applicant(s)

TAYLOR, KURT RUSSELL

Examiner

LeChi Truong

Art Unit

2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-57 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-57 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-57 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 9, 20, 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spofford et al (US. Patent 5,913,037) in view of Dobbins et al (US. Patent 5, 951,649) and further in view of Pearson (US. Patent 6,023,684).
4. As to claim 1, Spofford teaches the invention substantially as claimed including: OID (OID, col 2, ln 59-67, col 6, ln 1-45, col 4, ln 1-9, col 7, ln 20-62, col 8, ln 15-52), abstraction layer (MIB manager, col 2, ln 59-67/ col 6, ln 1-45/ col 4, ln 1-9/ col 7, ln 20-62/col 8, ln 15-52/ col 11, ln 1-30/ col 12, ln 40-67), an OID tree structure (col 2, ln 59-67/ col 6, ln 1-45/ col 4, ln 1-9/ col 7, ln 20-62/col 8; ln 15-52/ col 11, ln 1-30/ col 12, ln 40-67), query (query, col 11, ln 1-15), repository (the MIB 206, col 9, ln 40-41/ col 10, ln 58-59).
5. Spofford does not explicitly teach the OID abstraction layer is capable of receiving queries for objects in two or more different protocols, registering the ODI tree structure with a registry associated with the OID. However, Dobbins teaches the OID abstraction layer is capable of

Art Unit: 2194

receiving queries for objects in two or more different protocols (a standard interface for the Management Information Base for object access by any management protocol or other entity including SNMP, SNMPv2, DMP, col 16, ln 20-23), registering the ODI tree structure with a registry associated with the OID (Each specific managed object which is persistent is then created and calls the Persistent Object Manger to restore its values through the standard Managed Object base class... will call the Persistent Object Manager 77 to store the value, col 20, ln 33-39/ all Base Resources are registered into one of these tables for management purposes, col 24, ln 49-53).

6. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine teaching of Spofford and Dobbins because Dobbins 's the OID abstraction layer is capable of receiving queries for objects in two or more different protocols, registering the ODI tree structure with a registry associated with the OID would improve the use of Spofford and Dobbins's systems by providing a high availability of service, remoter management for supporting a number of different routing protocols.

7. Spofford and Dobbins do not explicit teach mapping queries from multiple protocol interfaces to application programming interface (API) requests that the repository understands. However, Pearson teaches mapping queries from multiple protocol interfaces to application programming interface (API) requests that the repository understands (convert data from a parsed client request to a format compatible with the API for the application service identified in the application service call, col 15-20/ converting client messages between the language supported by a client program and the language used to implement a application service, col 4, ln 67 to col 5, ln 1-3/convert s user queries from an Internet protocol to one compatible with a

Art Unit: 2194

database ... the user queries to the appropriate query language format for the, col 2, ln 60-65/ presentation logic 80 communication with client program using HTML documents, other communication protocols may be used, col 11, ln 42-45/ client messages which are in the format of a known internet service, such as E-mail, Files transfer protocol, col 5, ln 60-65/ col 10, ln 32-37).

8. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Spofford, Dobbins and Pearson because Pearson's mapping queries from multiple protocol interfaces to application programming interface (API) requests that the repository understands would improve the efficiency of Spofford and Dobbins's systems by allowing the customer with real time to access an execution of transaction commands over an open network without modifying a legacy database management system to support an increased number of users.

9. As to **claim 9**, it is an apparatus claim of claim 1; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 1 above. In additional, Pearson teaches mapping queries from multiple protocol interfaces to application programming interface (API) requests that the repository understands (convert data from a parsed client request to a format compatible with the API for the application service identified in the application service call, col 15-20/ converting client messages between the language supported by a client program and the language used to implement a application service, col 4, ln 67 to col 5, ln 1-3/convert s user queries from an Internet protocol to one compatible with a database ... the user queries to the appropriate query language format for the, col 2, ln 60-65/ presentation logic 80 communication with client program using HTML documents, other communication protocols may be used, col 11, ln 42-45/ client messages which

Art Unit: 2194

are in the format of a known internet service, such as E-mail, Files transfer protocol, col 5, ln 60-65/ col 10, ln 32-37), interpreting the first query according to the protocol recording to the protocol recognized by abstraction layer is one of the two or more different protocols(when a user wants to communicate an Internet service message such as e-email, to a customer service representative, the message is provided through proxy firewall 54 to the e-mail service for delivery to a customer service computer 54 . The customer service representative may be utilize information in the e-mail message to verify or correct user data through and application service 14, col 5, ln 61-65 and col 7, ln 27-35/ col 10, ln 32-39/ col 11, ln 15-20/ col 12, ln 58-60/ col 14, ln 35-43).

10. As to claims 20, 39, they are apparatus claims of claim 1; therefore, they are rejected for the same reason as claim 1 above.

11. Claims 2-4, 21-23, 40-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spofford et al (US. Patent 5,913,037), Dobbins et al (US. Patent 5, 951,649) in view of Pearson (US. Patent 6,023,648), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Whitehead et al (US. Patent 6,085,030).

12. As to claim 2, Spofford, Dobbin and Pearson do not teach an anchor point. However, Whitehead teaches an anchor point (an instance, col 14, ln 40-67/ col 10, ln 5-40).

13. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the inventions was made to combine teaching of Spofford, Dobbins, Pearson and Whitehead because

Art Unit: 2194

Whitehead's an instance would increase the integrity of Spofford, Dobbins and Pearson's systems by ensuring proper administration, authentication and runtime binding access to components offered in response to requests from the application.

14. **As to claim 3**, Dobbins teaches if the anchor point of the OID subtree structure is already registered with the OID abstraction layer, the registry is overwritten (col 20, ln 38-41).

15. **As to claim 4**, Whitehead teaches and identifies a repository that maintains object information for the request object based on the registered anchor point (the instance match the request, col 14, ln 40- 67).

16. **As to claims 21-23, 40-42**, they are apparatus claims of claims 2, 3, 4; they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 2, 3, 4 above.

17. Claims 5-8, 10-18, 24-37, 28-37, 43-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spofford (US. Patent 5,913,037), Dobbins et al (US. Patent 5,951,649) in view of Pearson (US. Patent 6,023,684), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ferguson (US. Patent 6,016,499).

18. **As to claim 5**, Spofford teaches request (col 10, ln 55-67 to col 1-16), reply message (the information as desired, col 10, ln 55-67 to col 1-16).

19. Spofford, Dobbins and Pearson do not teach API. However, Ferguson teaches API (API, col 5, ln 5-20/ col 8, ln 23-67).

20. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Spofford, Dobbins, Pearson and Ferguson because

Art Unit: 2194

Ferguson's API would increase the use of Spofford, Dobbins and Pearson's systems by allowing a system to make repository information accessible to tools that use SQL.

21. **As to claim 6**, Pearson teaches the reply message is formatted for an appropriate protocol for the target protocol interface, and wherein the appropriate is one of the two or more different protocols (col 11, ln 40-45).

22. **As to claim 7**, Pearson teaches interprets the request according to a protocol of the requesting protocol interface wherein the protocol of the requesting protocol interface is one of the two or more different protocols (when a user wants to communicate an Internet service message such as e-mail, to a customer service representative, the message is provided through proxy firewall 54 to the e-mail service for delivery to a customer service computer 54. The customer service representative may be utilize information in the e-mail message to verify or correct user data through and application service 14, col 5, ln 61-65 and col 7, ln 27-35/ col 10, ln 32-39/ col 11, ln 15-20/ col 12, ln 58-60/ col 14, ln 35-43/col 2, ln 56- 60/col 4, ln 45-49) and Ferguson teaches receives an API reply from the repository (API / an API reply translating a relational database language into an executable API, col 5, ln 5-20/ col 8, ln 21-67).

23. **As to claim 8**, Pearson teaches reformat the object data in the reply message according to the protocol of the requesting protocol interface (col 11, ln 40-45).

24. **As to claim 10**, Ferguson teaches mapped into the second query (translating a relational database language into an executable API, col 5, ln 5-20/ col 8, ln 21-67), a SQL tables (SQL columns (), col 9, ln 1-31).

Art Unit: 2194

25. **As to claim 11**, Ferguson teaches mapped into second query dues to a limitation (if the relational database language statement identifies a column of the table 80, the invention maps the attribute 76 to the column, col 8, ln 1-20).

26. **As to claim 12**, Spofford teaches the object (the object, col 10, ln 35-67), the first query (query, col 10, ln 35-67).

27. **As to claim 13**, Spofford teaches the object (information as desired, col 11, ln 1-16).

28. **As to claim 14**, Spofford teaches the protocol (the protocol, col 5, ln 5-67/ col 6, ln 1-67), the second reply (the information to the agent, col 11, ln 1-16).

29. **As to claim 15**, Spofford teaches the requester (the agent/ the SNMP requests, col 11, ln 1-16).

30. **As to claim 16**, Pearson teaches the plurality of repositories is formatted to support the two or more different protocols (col 10, ln 32-40/ col 14, ln 35-43).

31. **As to claim 17**, Spofford teaches SNMP (the SNMP, col 1, ln 10-23).

32. **As to claim 18**, Ferguson teaches LDAP (LDAP, col 5, ln 6-29).

33. **As to claims 24-37, 43-56**, they are apparatus claims of claims 5-9, 10-18; therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 5-9, 10-18 above.

34. **Claims 19, 38, 57** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spofford (US. Patent 5,913,037), Dobbins et al (US. Patent 5,951,649), in view of Pearson (US. Patent 6,023,684) as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Ferguson (US. Patent 6,016,499) and further in view of Admitted Prior Art (APA).

Art Unit: 2194

35. As to claim 19, Spofford, Dobbins, Pearson and Ferguson do not teach CIM/XML.

However, APA teaches CIM/XML(CIM/XML/CIM, col 2, ln 10-18/ CIM/XML, page 3, ln 1-14).

36. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the inventions was made to combine the teaching of Spofford, Dobbins, Pearson, Ferguson and APA because APA's CIM/XML would improve the flexibility of Spofford, Dobbins, Pearson and Ferguson's systems by allowing different management applications to collect the required data from a variety of sources.

37. As to claims 38, 57, they are apparatus claims of claim 19; therefore, they are rejected for the same reason as claim 19 above.

Response to the argument

38. Applicant's arguments filed 03/14/2005 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant amended the claims. Pearson's references meet the amended claims.

39. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 2194

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LeChi Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272 3767. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 - 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIP. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIP system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197(toll-free).

LeChi Truong

June 8, 2005


MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

